

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 11, 14 and 20-21 have been amended. Claims 8, 10, 13 and 19 have been canceled. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-12, 14-18 and 20-21 are now pending in the application.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 5, 8, 10, 13-15 and 18 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has re-written claims 6, 9, 11 and 14 as independent claims to make them allowable.

The Examiner objected to claims 19 and 20 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being in improper form because of multiple dependencies. Applicant has canceled claim 19, and has amended claim 20 to change its dependence from claim 1 to claim 2. Claim 20 is now in proper form.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 11, 12, 16-17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Mikuriya et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0091485). In view of the foregoing arguments and the amendments, the applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 19, as well as the limitation that the identification information of an information

element that has been updated and become old is set invalid. *Mikuriya et al.*, on the other hand, does not disclose identification information indicating whether information pertaining to a subject information element is valid or invalid, as is recited in the claim. Accordingly, *Mikuriya et al.* does not anticipate claim 1, which is submitted to be allowable.

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form. Amended claim 2 includes the limitation that the map-related information is updated in units of link strings. That limitation is not disclosed by *Mikuriya et al.*, which thus cannot anticipate claim 2. Claim 2 is submitted to be allowable.

Several claims were rewritten in independent form by including the subject matter of allowable claims. Claim 6 was rewritten with the features of allowable claim 8, claim 9 with the features of allowable claim 10 and claim 11 with the features of allowable claim 13. Claim 14 was also rewritten in independent form, and as indicated by the Examiner, is allowable.

With respect to claim 16, *Mikuriya et al.* does not disclose that information used to identify each of the nodes includes node position information related to latitude and longitude, and that information used to identify each of the links includes a combination of the node position information related to the latitude and longitude of a node at one end of a target link, as well as the node position

information related to the latitude and longitude of a node at another end of the target link. At least for that reason, *Mikuriya et al.* does not anticipate claim 16, which is submitted to be allowable.

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-21 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of the copending Application No. 10/514,423. Applicant is providing a terminal disclaimer, filed concurrently herewith, to overcome the provisional rejection.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #029267.56084US).

Respectfully submitted,

March 27, 2007



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169
Paolo M. Trevisan
Registration No. 45,164

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:PMT:crr
2978601